

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action of August 27, 2007, in which claims 1-30 are presently pending. Of those, claims 6-10 and 21-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter as set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. With regard to the art of record, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16, 18-24, 26 and 28-30 have now been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0174218 of Dick, et al. In addition, claims 5, 10, 15, 17, 25 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick, in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0233420 of Stark, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

As an initial matter, system claims 6-10 and 21-30 have been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the §101 rejections thereto moot. However, the Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the same (and address the outstanding §101 rejections thereto) in one or more continuation applications.

With regard to the §102 rejections of independent claims 1 and 11 the Applicants respectfully traverse the same for the reason that Dick fails to teach each element of the claims as presently worded, as outlined in further detail below.

At the outset, Applicants point out that the pending claims are directed toward message content construction and generation (see, e.g., claim 1: "...*configuring* a simple object access protocol (SOAP) *message header* associated with a SOAP message body to include message meta-data and semantics describing at least a portion of the content of the SOAP message body so as to enable a receiver to interpret and process the content of the SOAP message body using the meta-data and semantics included in the SOAP

message header...”; and claim 11: “*generating message meta-data within a header* of a simple object access protocol (SOAP) message having a SOAP message body, said meta-data describing at least a portion of the content of said SOAP message body so as to enable a receiver to interpret and process the content of the SOAP message body using the meta-data and semantics included in the SOAP message header...”

In contrast, a review of the Dick publication reveals that the teachings thereof are limited to capturing, processing and analyzing data in a message stream (i.e., performing operations on received messages), and not the particular configuration and generation of messages and message headers as presently claimed. (Dick, paragraphs [0001], [0010], [0014], [0015], [0023]-[0028])

Notwithstanding this distinction between the claimed message generation and the message capturing, processing, and analysis discussed in Dick, the teachings in Dick also fail to disclose the claimed SOAP message header/body attributes. In support of the present rejections of claims 1 and 11, the Examiner cites FIGS. 1 and 2 and paragraphs [0030]-[0040] of Dick. Although no specific text excerpts and reference numbers were identified by the Examiner as teaching the claim elements, Applicants point out the following text taken from paragraphs [0035] [0036] and [0039] of Dick, respectively:

“[0035] Once it has application level messages, the capture device 200 must figure out if they contain B2B XML messages. Because these messages may flow over many application level transports, use many different packaging standards, and use many different XML message protocols, etc., getting at this data requires a stackable message unraveler 206. For each potential combination of layers with an XML message at the top, the capture device has a registered stack of pluggable unravelers 208. As illustrated in FIG. 2, some examples of pluggable unravelers 208 that may be plugged into the stack include: an OAGIS pluggable unraveler, a BizTalk pluggable unraveler, a SOAP

pluggable unraveler, a MIME pluggable unraveler, a SMTP pluggable unraveler, a TTXML pluggable unraveler, a GCI pluggable unraveler, an ebXML pluggable unraveler, a JMS pluggable unraveler, a RosettaNet pluggable unraveler, a MQSeries pluggable unraveler, as well as customizable pluggable unravelers.”

“[0036] In operation, as messages come in from the TCP reassembler 204, the unraveling framework 206 and 208 examines the application header to see if it supports that header. It then examines the next level of header and proceeds in this manner until it either finds an unrecognized header or finds the top-level XML message, which it passes on to the data extractor. Because the headers may have relevant information in and of themselves, each pluggable unraveler in the stack 208 is configured to capture some of the header information at each level and pass that on as well.”

“[0039] FIG. 3 shows a software stack of a processing device 300 in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention. The lowest level function is a data store 302 that contains an archive of all data received from capture devices. This can be either a reliable file system or a database management system. As this data comes in, a global data cube builder 304 takes the local data cubes from the capture devices and aggregates them. It specifies a new dimension of time and adds indications of semantic relationships among elements in different messages based on either analysis of the message headers or business rules.”

As can be seen from paragraph [0035], Dick uses a series of pluggable unravelers to determine whether the various application level transports, packaging standards and message protocols are first supported by the capture device 200. Dick does so through examination of the application header itself. However, this is not the same as a message header enabling a receiver to interpret and process the content of the SOAP message body using the meta-data and semantics included in the SOAP message header itself, as

claimed in the instant application. Rather, if the framework of Dick supports the application header, it moves on to examine the next level of header and so on until it either finds an unrecognized header or finds the top-level XML message. In the latter case, the unraveler simply passes the top-level XML message on to the data extractor. (Dick, paragraph [0036]). Although Dick further indicates in paragraph [0036] that “the headers may have relevant information in and of themselves,” such header information is not specified by Dick and hence Dick fails to teach that the header information can enable a receiver to interpret and process the content of the message body using the meta-data and semantics included in the message header itself.

Finally, in discussing the processing of message information in paragraph [0039], Dick simply states that the global data cube builder 304 adds indications of semantic relationships among elements in different messages based on either analysis of the message headers or business rules. Thus, Dick only analyzes message headers for the purpose of determining semantic relationships among elements in different messages, and not for the purposes of interpreting and process the content of the message body associated with the message header, using the meta-data and semantics included in the message header itself.

Therefore, because Dick fails to teach each and every element of claims 1 and 11, the claims are not anticipated by Dick. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the applicable §102 rejection of the remaining claims have been overcome. Furthermore, since the Stark reference also fails to teach or suggest the missing claim elements described above, the §103 rejection of claims 5, 15 and 17 has also been overcome.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered. However, if any fees are due (in addition to a one month extension of time fee) with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0458 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,  
JOSHY JOSEPH, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By   
Sean F. Sullivan  
Registration No. 38,328  
Customer No. 46429

Date: November 26, 2007  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929